

**From:** Linda Beattie [mailto:lbeattie@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 9:07 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** MLPA Proposal 2-XA

As a member of the coastal fishing community & a life long resident of the city of Pacifica Ca. I would like to express my undivided endorsement of MLPA Proposal 2-XA. It is clear that it encompasses all of the criteria of the MLPA process & is the only logical choice as it keeps the fishing community involved. Make no mistake, the fishing enthusiasts are in fact your real stewards of the resource as we have a vested interest to protect it. Proposal 2-XA makes sense for all involved. Please do the right thing for the future & adopt this proposal.

Thank You,  
Pat Beattie

---

---

**From:** Erik Kjaer [mailto:ahnicka@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 1:06 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Proposals

BRTF,

I am almost 4 years old. Please pick 2XA. See you in San Rafael.

Ahnicka

---

-----Original Message-----

From: AllenBushnell [mailto:[bushnell@ucsc.edu](mailto:bushnell@ucsc.edu)]  
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:11 PM  
To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments  
Subject: 2-XA

Mr. Chrisman and all others this may concern:

Please accept this email in support of MPA proposal 2-XA.

I am 55-year old lifelong fisherman, now with two children ages 9 and 13.

I really want my kids to be able to fish in California, and fear draconian fishing closures that would result from well-funded groups' misplaced sense of eco-activism.

Having said that, I would really like my kids to be able to fish in California, and support totally the true conservation efforts that I

and my peers practice as a matter of course, and in order to preserve the abundance of most species we enjoy.

The MLPA process is long and grueling and complicated. It is very difficult to understand everything that is going on, and what decisions are being made, and why those decisions are made.

I was dismayed by the action of the Fish and Game Commission when it was time to select the final MPA maps for the South Central Region (my fishing area). I'm hoping this time around, a more reasonable and honest decision can be arrived at by the Commission, one that will honor the efforts of the stakeholder's groups that put their lives on hold to help draw up the maps.

I urge you to accept Proposal 2-XA because this proposal enjoys the most support from fellow anglers, both recreational and commercial as well as the diving community. The proposal meets the DFG feasibility guidelines, and meets the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. This is the most balanced proposal on the table.

I believe this is the only proposal that will enjoy broad public support and is also more enforceable than the alternate proposals.

Thank you for the time spent reading my letter.

Allen Bushnell

---

---

**From:** tony blomert [mailto:mrblomert@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 3:14 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

**BRTF**

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Thanks for your Consideration,  
Anthony Blomert  
Concerned California Citizen and Fish Eater  
Pinole, ca

---

---

**From:** bradrey65@comcast.net [mailto:bradrey65@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 8:00 PM  
**To:** //www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/publiccomments.asp@mx1.ceres.ca.gov  
**Cc:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** 2-xa

To whom it may concern:

I am a Forty something male who has been raised in and around water. My father and I fish religiously every week, and, take two trips a year just to get away and spend time together. Now it's an entire family thing. I have a son who is just getting into fishing and loving every minute of it.

My point here is we are running out of areas to fish.

I, my father and my family support 2-xa and I hope you make the right decisions regarding our future.

Brad Morelock

Antioch Ca.

---

---

**From:** Becky Hulick [mailto:bbhulick@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 8:48 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov  
**Subject:** Hulick's Support of Porposal 2XA

To Whom It May Concern,

Subject: Support of Proposal 2XA

My wife & I have enjoyed the Sea Ranch area for 25 years or more, hiking, golfing, fishing, & diving; however, we are concerned about the original objectives of the MLPA and are writing in support of proposal 2XA which as we understand this proposal, sets aside the least amount of coastline and is endorsed by local landowners & families while being sensitive to the environment. It is well thought out by people who understand the environment & its needs.

Both Black Point & Pebble Beach access areas will still be open to non-consumptive users paralleling the Sea Ranch image. As we see it: this proposal is fair to both public & private land without putting undue hardships on several private land owners and their families.

My wife & I strongly support proposal 2XA

Sincerely,  
Bruce & Becky Hulick  
Santa Rosa, Ca

---

---

**From:** Bryan Gilbert [mailto:bryanfgilbert@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 4:07 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Save Our Salmon

As a fifth generation Californian and avid Outdoorsman, I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. This proposal is a well thought out and balanced approach to achieve conservation goals with the least impact economically on the commercial and recreational fisheries here in our great State of California.

I want as much as anyone to have fish for my children and grandchildren and a strong Ocean Ecosystem. Many of the other Proposals achieve this goal with little regard for the socioeconomic impact to fishermen or the fishing industry! Proposal 2-XA will achieve the conservation goals without putting Commercial fishermen, Party Boats, and Bait Shops out of Business and allow us (sport fishermen and women) to enjoy the sport we so love... responsibly as stewards of the Sea.

Please consider 2-XA. It is a balanced, reasonable solution.

---

---

**From:** Jackie Daniels [mailto:jackiedaniels@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 3:42 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MPA Rules in California

Hello, my name is Charles Gonzalas Jr. I'm 14 years old and live in Emeryville, Ca. I have been fishing with my grandpa for 5 years in the ocean. I love going with him. But I'm tired of him telling me it may soon be over for us. He tries to explain all the new rules to me, I guess we have to have some conservative things happen. I read the MLPA proposals and he tried to explain what would happen if and when they take effect. I'm with helping, so I think 2-XA is the best way to try this.

Thanks for your time,  
Charles Gonzalas Jr.

---

---

**From:** Cindy Crnkovich [mailto:ccrnkovich@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:45 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Diver Support 2-XA

As a PADI certified dive master, who has been diving for over 10 years, I support **2-XA** for the following reasons:

- Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of MLPA, and at the same time, does not have significant adverse impact on divers.
- Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support.
- Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster.
- Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "high" level of protection.
- Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of divers, including women divers like myself.

Thank you for your consideration of this preferred proposal.

Cindy Crnkovich

[Ccrnkovich@comcast.net](mailto:Ccrnkovich@comcast.net)

---

---

**From:** SlplessnSF@aol.com [mailto:SlplessnSF@aol.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 12:01 PM

**To:** Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments

**Subject:** MLPA - Support of Proposal 2-XA

March 29, 2008

MLPA Comments  
Secretary Chrisman

To whom it may concern,

I am a California native living in the Bay Area all my life. Since the first time my Dad took me fishing at age 4, I have enjoyed recreational fishing. This started at the Tilden Park trout pond, the Berkeley Pier and finally, fast forward 48 years, as a private boat owner.

I married my high school sweetheart in 1983. We had a daughter in 1988 and couldn't have been happier. A short 15 months later my wife passed after a nasty fight with cancer and I was a single father. It wasn't easy raising a daughter yet, sparing you the details, we did find a common bond, fishing. My daughter wasn't always the best student and I could see her going either way, trouble or keeping her act together. So far she has stayed out of trouble. I never remarried.

Fishing from my boat in the SF bay or ocean is something we both look forward to doing together. It keeps the communication lines open. This is also something I look forward to doing with my grandchildren should I ever be blessed with them.

So, you can understand I do not like any restrictions on my fishing rights. After reviewing all the surviving proposals on the table, I would like urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish & Game Commission to **support Proposal 2-XA. 2-XA meets or exceeds the goals established MLPA.** There is no reason to be more restrictive as in the other two remaining proposals.

Dale A. Myer  
Clayton, CA

---

-----Original Message-----

From: dale della rosa [<mailto:dellaros@pacbell.net>]

Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:19 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

To:                   The members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force, and  
                          The California Fish and Game Commission

Subject:    Support for Proposal 2XA for the North Central Coast Phase  
                          of the MLPA

Dear Members,

I am writing to inform you that I am strongly in favor of adopting Proposal 2XA. Of the options available, Proposal 2XA has struck a balance that fully accomplishes the goals of the MLPA while having the least negative impact on recreational fishermen and the economic benefits that result from sustainable use of our ocean resources.

Salt Point State Park in particular is one of the main reasons for my firm support of Proposal 2XA. During my family's first trip to Salt Point my son was with us, but hadn't actually been born yet. The next year when he was less than a year old and every year thereafter we have been to Salt Point to fish, camp, and dive. We are a family of environmentally conscious consumptive users. That same son is now 23 and working his way thru college. In the breaks from his unbelievably busy schedule Salt Point State Park is still our favorite place to fish from our kayaks and dive for abalone.

Recreational users like my family have established a long-standing tradition of sustainable consumptive use at the Park. Placing any part of Salt Point State Park in an SMR would unfairly exclude those traditional users and contribute to the ever accelerating loss of recreational fishing opportunities that has been plaguing this state in recent years.

In closing, let me say that Proposal 2XA is the balanced choice since it will have a profoundly positive effect on marine life while at the same time have the least negative impact on California Communities as a whole.

Sincerely,

Dale Della Rosa  
Martinez, CA

---

---

**From:** David Renner [mailto:davidrenner@cox.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 4:51 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** support for Proposal 2-XA

I have been closely following the current process of the MLPA. Although I live in So. Cal I am acutely aware that this decision in adopting one of the 3 proposals for the North Central region is pivotal. I say this because the stakeholders that are the most affected, the fisherman, have come together and crafted the best proposal being offered for consideration. It is well thought out, complete with a significant amount of no take/reserve areas while also minimizing the economic hardship that the State can ill afford at this time. It is consistent with the spirit of the Marine Life Protection Act and with the Science Advisory Team recommendations. Proposal 4 is too extreme/restrictive, not grounded in the SAT guidelines and will have far reaching economic hardship on the recreational and commercial fishing industries. Proposal 1-3 is incomplete and an incoherent blend of 2 separate proposals neither reaching the beneficial conservation goals of Proposal 2-XA. I urge the Blue Ribbon Task Force to adopt the obviously superior Proposal 2-XA and not discount the hard work and insight of the collective group of fishermen. To do otherwise would send a clear and alarming signal to the stakeholders south of Pt. Conception and to the remaining areas of the State that their voices and best efforts will not be heard. This would all but guarantee a contentious and unproductive (or worse) round of negotiations and all the people of the State would be the worse for it. Please give your support to Proposal 2-XA

sincerely,  
Dave Renner  
Pursuit 2350/FreeSwimmer

---

---

**From:** Dew Winter [mailto:dew@petersontechservices.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:56 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** 2XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force

What a job you have to do! No matter what, someone gets hurt.

I have been following this process as a concerned voter and fisherman. I come from a long line of fishermen and fisherwoman. As my Great Grandpa taught my Grandpa and so on I have brought up my kids and their friends to appreciate fishing and the outdoors. My girls have become great stewards of the environment and as they are now becoming adults they will go on to teach their kids and so on. Fishing and the outdoors is the binding that keeps it all together. It sure beats them being in the streets!

I would like to vote for Proposal 2-XA. It meets all the science and conservation goals of the MLPA and still allows for sportsman, and coastal communities access to a sustainable ocean.

Sportsmen and women are the stewards of our ocean, its caretaker. Don't take that away from our future generations.

Duane L Winter  
San Mateo, Ca.

---

---

**From:** Dew Winter [mailto:dew@petersontechservices.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:01 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA

To whom it may concern

I am a California voter that is very concerned and dismayed about what is going on in this process.

I have been involved, watched online and attended meetings, as this process has taken place.

I am an avid outdoorsman and get to the water 50 plus days a year. I spend \$10,000 to \$12,000 annually

In pursuit of my passion. My girls are now 18 and 19 years old and can out fish most men.

I would like to see MLPA proposal 2XA go forward as it seems to allow more public access. We need to be able to bring up our kids and future kids to enjoy the outdoors and our wildlife. It sure beats the streets and drugs.

Thank you

Duane L Winter  
San Mateo, Ca.

---

---

**From:** Ed Essick [mailto:e.essick@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 7:55 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MPLA plan

Gentlemen:

I am writing to support proposal 2-XA as it the the most well balanced and sensible plan for all concerned. Proposal 2-XA is the best choice for these reasons:

1. It is a strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers.
2. It achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA
3. It meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines
4. It is enforceable and will have broad public support
5. It is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups



6. It has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster
7. It places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.
8. It places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.
9. It has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen.
10. Individual components have the support of many in the conservation community.

For all of these reasons I urge you to support Proposal 2-XA for the MPLA.

Sincerely,

Ed Essick

---

---

**From:** Erik Kjaer [mailto:bodegaerik@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 9:39 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Proposal 2-XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force,

As a recreational fisherman and avid abalone diver, I strongly support Proposal 2-XA.

Erik Kjaer  
[BodegaErik@sbcglobal.net](mailto:BodegaErik@sbcglobal.net)

---

---

**From:** Carletta Hollenback [mailto:cfhollen@mcn.org]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 2:38 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Propasal 2XA

I have lived on the Mendocino Coast for seventy years and have seen a lot of changes. I am a fisherman and I support Proposal 2XA.

This needs to pass and be put into place.

Fred Hollenback  
Fort Bragg, CA

---

**From:** Frank Ledesma [mailto:ledesma6670@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 1:07 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Support 2-XA

Hello, My name is Gabriella Ledesma and I fully support 2-XA. My husband and often our children are off fishing in the ocean we all love and respect. 2-XA is the only save proposal for my husband and my children to go and and spend some great quality time fishing without putting there lives in any danger. Please do not take away a long time family tradition of fishing.

Proposal 2-XA meets department of fish and game guidelines and has a broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups.

Thank you,  
Gabriella Ledesma

---

---

**From:** Jim N/A [mailto:helicon01@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 8:49 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** Support of Proposal 2-Xa

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the BRTF,

Proposal 2-XA is based on conservation and safety. It is scientifically based and meets the criteria of the MLPA process. The fishing community was asked to be involved and have considered conservation goals along with the socia-economic impacts the process would have for the North Central coast as a whole.

The MLPA process is suppose to be open to everyone. I sincerely hope that this is the case.

Fishing as a whole is a conservation based practice. The first phase of the MLPA process used unproven theories and didn't take many factors into account. Access points and small boat safety being just a couple.

Please seriously consider the ramifications to this area before rushing to a decision. I would have liked to see what is truly happening in the Central zone before rushing to judgement on other areas of the MLPA. You will be dealing with people's livelihoods and huge regional economic losses if proposal 2-XA is not accepted and passed to the fish and Game commission for consideration.

Thank You,

James Volberding

---

---

**From:** Jana Van Housen [mailto:jana0717@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 1:52 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2XA

My name is Jana Van Housen. I have been a sport fisher women for many years. I enjoy the challenge of landing a ling cod, salmon or other game fish. I have been informed of the proposal 2XA. I would like to add my name to the list of supporters of this proposal.

I understand the need to monitor the safety of marine life as well as the livelihood of commercial fisherman,etc. I feel this proposal is the least invasive. Again, please add my name for support on this issue.

Jana Van Housen  
Lakeport, CA

---

---

**From:** Ustrapper@wmconnect.com [mailto:Ustrapper@wmconnect.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 5:32 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MPA's and proposal 2-xa

Dear members of the BRTF: Thank you for all your hard work. As one who fishes the ocean, I do feel the need for conservation not preservation. The former is wise use, the latter is non-use. I believe that proposal 2-XA is the only way to go. It achieves the goals of the MLPA, it also put the restrictions where they will do the most good. It also is within the frame work of DF+G guidlines. 2-XA will still allow for resonable fishing for Californians, it also is able to be enforced. Again I strongly urge you to vote for proposal 2-XA.

Thank you  
Jeff J. Whedbee

---

---

**From:** James N Culberson [mailto:j.culberson@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 6:20 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** proposed changes

First I would like to commend you for your efforts in trying to protect our fisheries for getting any worse than they are right now.I know there is not much time to be making hasty decisions or no actions at all.Then look back at this time in our life and say i wish we would have done this or that instead of what we will ultimately decide in the near future.With that said I am a sport fisherman,I enjoy providing fresh fish to my family at

the same time enjoy being out on the ocean with my friends and colleagues. I think most fishermen would not mind giving up a few seasons of fishing if it would surely help the population of the different fish rebound. After all sportsman are truly the greatest contributors to the health and well being of our fisheries. The problem that I see is not solely in the ocean. We need to address the rivers that are as important if not more!

With the proposals being put on the table I hope and pray that you will all vote for the 2-XA plan.

Thank you for your time.

Jim Culberson

San Jose, California

---

**From:** Joe & Sharon Pearson [mailto:pearson@mcn.org]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:20 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Proposed MLP's

I support Proposal 2-XA

---

---

**From:** John Zenner, IDEA Consulting Group, Inc. [mailto:johnz@ideaconsultinggroup.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:54 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** In support of MLPA Draft proposal 2-XA and VERY MUCH AGAINST PLAN 4!!!!

My name is John Zenner and am happy to see from the public record all of my 4 siblings and my wife have also written to in support of Draft Proposal 2-XA. As an avid scuba and skin diver in addition to being a completely passionate sports fisherman, I have also encouraged many of my skin/scuba diving and fishing friends to write, and I am happy to see many of their names entered already in the public record. As has been stated for the record many times before, many of us support of the underlying theory behind creation of the MLPA law, however (as is often the case) the difference between success and failure is all in the implementation. I have spent over a week drafting this letter, and it is long, but I hope you take the time to read it as I feel I am a good representative of the general public mindset associated with the MLPA process here in California.

I am a lifelong California resident, not many of us around these days it seems. I had the thrill of having my grandfather teach me to fish in the Pacific Ocean, and what great memories those are. My brothers and I grew up fishing almost every day in Santa Cruz and had wonderful experiences and were able to share the bounty of the sea with our families. I have enjoyed diving and fishing all up and down the coast of California from San Diego to Eureka and have taught my 2 children Thomas (now 7 and been fishing since age 1) and Elizabeth (now 3 and been fishing since age 2) to enjoy our great ocean as well. We are proud of our stewardship of our ocean

waters that we love so much, and very responsible in our take. Whenever possible, I teach children to understand what are responsible and sustainable sport and commercial fisheries practices, as well as to point out those which clearly harm our fisheries. We are avid conservationists, and support the key concepts of the MLPA.

I am not a political activist by any measure yet however I find myself increasingly driven to participate in this MLPA process in support of proposal 2-XA. My wife and siblings would fall in the same category, yet it took very little urging my behalf to get them to write letters immediately too. Why? Because we feel that the MLPA process has gone completely amuck in California with a definite bias towards not only achieving the original goals of the MLPA, but to whatever extent possible, far exceeding those goals to benefit a small majority of our population that wants to prevent anyone from trespassing in "their ocean". We have grown up living on, playing on, praying on, and fishing on and in the ocean and we do not support the current (and in fact) elitist viewpoint of excluding access to the ocean for anyone who wants to harvest anything. I believe that elitist vision is of an ocean where mankind does not have any presence, and that space is reserved for research only and viewing through the lens of an aquarium. However I believe that the general public's vision is of an ocean protected from clearly detrimental practices (many of which have not been addressed by the DFG) and where man is part of that ecosystem living in a balanced symbiosis. My foundation for this statement is based upon my educational background in Biology coupled with having served the Peace Corps as a professional fish farmer, and my 44 years worth of experiences as a recreational scuba diver, free diver, spear fisherman, abalone fisherman and sport fisherman.

**Simply blocking consumptive usage over massive percentages of our ocean without any regard to first addressing the other harmful factors affecting our fisheries and ecosystems is an uneducated and naive approach to managing a complex system problem.** That approach can be viewed as nothing short of public admission of complete failure at fisheries management, albeit obviously a simpleton's win from an extreme environmentalist perspective. Through my association with the Coastside Fish Club, I also fully understand the political landscape shaping the MLPA process, so I can see how the easier approach is more appealing. However, I implore you to think about this further and act with a deeper conscience. **There is NOTHING that suggests the plan with the most restrictive parameters should be adopted.** The goals of proposals 1/3 and 4 seem to be removing the public consumptive users as much as possible for the benefit of an extreme environmentalist MINORITY. It is critical for me to remind the BRTF, DFG and the SAT that there is NOTHING in the MLPA law that requires the plan with the greatest possible restrictions to be adopted, yet that seems to be the goal of Proposal 4.

As originally stated, I support the basic premise of the MLPA and I know (as do you) that draft proposal 2XA exceeds those requirements, while still providing good SAFE public access to consumptive users, who represent the MAJORITY of my fellow Californians. Small boaters like myself are acutely interested in SAFE access to fishable waters close to our ports in Half Moon Bay, San Francisco, Bodega Bay and Point Arena. The State of California should be seriously considering the very real liability issues associated with forcing small boaters to travel much greater distances than is safe simply to support a MLPA plan that there are absolutely no requirements to accept to begin with (draft proposal 4).

I believe that if the BRTF and DFG does some soul searching and steps away from the heavy burden of political pressure, they must understand that proposal 2XA is a reasonable middle ground for ALL parties with clear success ensured based upon the original vision of the MLPA, not the corrupted delusion that has come to drive much of the current process. For my sake, for the sake of all Californians, and for the sake of our children's future usage of our great Pacific waters, I hope that you will not bow to political pressure, but rather do what you know to be the right thing by supporting 2XA as a plan that ALL Californian's can live with, and be proud of in the future.

Thank you for being thoughtful with your considerations and true with your actions

Sincerely,

John M. Zenner

---

---

**From:** jmp332@comcast.net [mailto:jmp332@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 9:48 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Proposal 2xa

To Whom It May Concern:

I have lived my entire 56 years in Santa Cruz and for the past 30 years have fished areas from the Monterey Bay up to Bodega Bay. I have been following the MLPA process from the start, and as an environmentalist, conservationist, and sport fisherman I strongly urge your support for Proposal 2xa. This proposal meets all the criteria required by the process and includes consideration for all user groups.

Sincerely,  
Joseph Patten

---

---

**From:** Judy Rodgers [mailto:judyrodg@pacbell.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 3:43 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

BRTF

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Judy Rodgers  
Chef and Owner  
Zuni Cafe San Francisco

---

**From:** Keith Fukuhara [mailto:kfukuhar@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 8:54 PM

**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** regarding the proposals

MPLA Committee;

After reviewing the three proposals, Proposal 2-XA, Proposal 1-3, and Proposal 4, a compromising proposal is Proposal 2-XA. I primarily am a shore-based fisherman that looks for safe and easy access to shore based fishing locations. Proposal 1-3 restricts access to shore access around the Bean Hollow SP and Pebble Beach SP areas. Safe shore based access to areas that have rock fish as a targeted species have been reduced for shore based fishermen. Under the last MPLA adoption, areas from Greyhound Rock SP through Franklin Pt. have been protected under the SMR label. As most cause and effect relationships, I fear that fishermen like myself will seek out those areas that are dangerously protect by steep cliffs and private property.

I understand the urgency that the committee is trying to adopt protected areas. I am not convinced that shore-based anglers are impacting the overall fisheries. It appears that the 2007 rockfish season was shortened because of an effect of salmon charters defaulting to rockfish fishing to supplement the lack of ocean based salmon. The impact in take of rockfish, severely pressured rockfish. It appears to me based on this information, it was recreational charters and commercial rockfishing resulting in heavier burden on the rockfish fisheries. Between Ano Nuevo SP and the Golden Gate, there are not that many "safely" accessible areas on the coast if the area between Bean Hollow and Pebble Beach are closed down. Based on the maps, the Fitzgerald MR area with either be under an SMCA or SMR label. Although the SMCA "may" allow recreational based fishing, I do know that the volunteer guides at Fitzgerald MR have been pushing to prohibit any recreational fishing, and under a SMCA, fishing could be restricted.

I like proposal 2-XA because it leaves open Bean Hollow SP through Pebble Beach to recreational fishing and use. It also protects half of Fitzgerald MR under an SMR listing, protecting it from recreational fishing use. It leaves open the southern half of Fitzgerald under a SMCA zone, possibly allowing for fishing and other uses. The southern half of the Fitzgerald MR is not easily accessible by foot, especially on high tides. Similar habitat to the areas in the Bean Hollow area is the already closed Franklin Point. In fact, there are more protected pools and areas in Franklin Point than the Bean Hollow Area.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinionions,

Keith Fukuhara  
[kfukuhar@comcast.net](mailto:kfukuhar@comcast.net)

---

**From:** Terry Fujii [mailto:tkfuj@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 3:43 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Vote for proposal 2-XA

I am retired and my wife and I enjoy costal fishing in our 21' boat. Due to the small size of our boat, we are restricted to near-shore waters because of safety issues and the possibility of weather getting bad while we are out. So we cruise close to port for safety reasons.

Proposal 2-XA provides the most access for us, especially from the ports of Bodega Bay, Golden Gate and Half Moon Bay in the areas available to us. The other proposals, especially Proposal 4 would effectively ban consumptive fishing in the areas we can safely reach with our boat. We have always been able to catch a few fish to eat, proposal 4 would only allow us to look at the ocean.

Proposal 2-XA actually applies the science the the SAT has provided and achieves the goals of the MLPA while maintaining a balance of marine reserves and people actually using the ocean.

As recreational fishermen my wife and I encourage the BRTF to select Proposal 2-XA as the MLPA for our area.

Respectfully,

Ken Fujii  
Martinez, CA

---

**From:** Nicole Johnson [mailto:coastalcrave@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 7:33 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

I support Proposal 2-XA

LaShawn Johnson

---

**From:** Layne Filbrun [mailto:filby209@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 8:15 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:**

I support Proposal 2-XA

---

**From:** Lynn Hollenback [mailto:lynnhollenback@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 1:40 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** support of 2XA

My name is Lynn Hollenback, I spent most of my life growing up in Fort Bragg and surrounding areas. I have been an avid fisherman and hunter along the north coast for several years. I understand the concerns of the need to protect the marine life along our coast line. I have been advised of the proposals for marine protection. I would like to add my name to the list of supporters of the proposal 2XA.

Sincerely;



Lynn Hollenback  
Lakeport, CA.

---

**From:** Matt McCarthy [mailto:matt.mccarthy@Quagga.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 12:00 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** RE: MPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

Please consider 2-XA. It is a balanced, reasonable solution.

As a third generation Californian and avid Outdoorsman, I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. This proposal is a well thought out and balanced approach to achieve conservation goals with the least impact economically on the commercial and recreational fisheries here in our great State of California.

I want as much as anyone to have fish for my children and grandchildren and a strong Ocean Ecosystem. Many of the other Proposals achieve this goal with little regard for the socioeconomic impact to fishermen or the fishing industry! Proposal 2-XA will achieve the conservation goals without putting Commercial fishermen, Party Boats, and Bait Shops out of Business and allow us (sport fishermen and women) to enjoy the sport we so love... responsibly as stewards for the Sea.

Please consider 2-XA. It is a balanced, reasonable solution.

Matt McCarthy,  
Fair Oaks CA

---

**From:** Michael j Ryan [mailto:michael4104@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 4:50 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments; MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Marine Life Protection Act

Thank you for the effort you are spending on the Marine Life Protection Act project. Working out the details of implementing this 1999 California Law is no easy task. I have read the many proposals put forth to you over these last months. To me Proposal 2-XA is what the voters of California had in mind. I'll list some of the highlights that make this proposal stand out above the others. I also list some of the major differences between 2-XA and other proposals.

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. It meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines. It is enforceable and is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups. I believe it will have broad public support also.

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster. It places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of

protection. It also places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay. It creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

I am a believer in conservation, maintaining healthy fish population levels are of the utmost importance to me. In closing I would ask that you take a hard look at Proposal 2-XA.

Thank you,

Michael j Ryan

San Jose, Ca

---

**From:** Mike Giraudo [mailto:mike@intecsolutions.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 9:56 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** 2-XA

I am a recreational angler, boat owner, a business owner, father of a six year old boy, and a lifelong resident of California. I am very concerned about the MLPA, the finshery and the recreational fishing community. As such, I strongly support 2-XA.

In my evaluation, I have found that 2-XA is the ONLY proposal that balances the requirements of the law with the needs of those who use the area in question. And it will have the least impact on the economy of our coastal communities and the recreation fishing industry and related industries (hotels, launch ramps, restaurants, etc.) while still scoring very high marks for conservation.

Please support 2-XA.

Mike Giraudo  
Pacifica, Ca

---

**From:** Mitch Johnson [mailto:blondvikingusa@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 7:10 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Mlpa

Do the right thing,

2-XA all the way

---

**From:** Nancy Lace Ratcliff [mailto:btzero@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 8:28 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** MLPA proposals for region 2

March 29, 2008  
Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I'm in favor of Proposal 2-XA. This proposal provides for the socio-economic interests of the residents that live and work in the region between Pigeon Point and Alder Creek and this proposal protects and conserves the marine life in this region according to the MLPA scientific and conservation guidelines. It is a balanced proposal and does not punish the public by taking away an unnecessary quantity of the marine resources from public access.

This proposal presents the zoning that is the most reasonable if you consider feasibility of enforcement. Proposal 2-XA is the most economical zoning plan to manage and monitor. In 5 years the MLPA requires a review of the zoning. The scientific studies will determine if the marine reserves have been effective and adjustments can be made in the future to increase or decrease the zoning.

Nancy Ratcliff

---

**From:** Patty Unterman [mailto:pattyunterman@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 2:57 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** paul johnson  
**Subject:** support for Proposal 2-XA

BRTF

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It **strikes a balance**

between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Thanks for your consideration,  
Patricia Unterman  
chef/owner Hayes Street Grill, a 29 year old restaurant in  
San Francisco that cooks sustainably harvested seafood  
San Francisco, CA  
415 863-5355

---

**From:** paul johnson [mailto:pj1121@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 1:56 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** comment in support of proposal 2x-a

BRTF

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Thanks for your Consideration  
Paul Johnson  
Monterey Fish  
San Francisco, Ca.

---

**From:** Paula Wakamiya [mailto:pwakamiya@sanjuan.edu]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 9:48 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** 2 XA Proposal

I support the adoption of the 2XA Proposal. This proposal sets specific areas aside to protect our precious marine resources and keeps enough areas accessible for sport diving and fishing.  
Please adopt this proposal.  
Respectfully yours,  
Paula Wakamiya  
California resident

---

**From:** Neiner, Randi [mailto:RNeiner@shaklee.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 2:36 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Thanks

Randi Neiner, Ph.D.

---

**From:** alfio nonno [mailto:gamehunter57@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:59 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** fishing future, 2-xa

I am writing to you to ask you to support 2-XA. I cannot believe our current fishing problems that someone has created , I want to be able to take my kids fishing , so please put backroom politics aside and do the right thing.

Please support 2-XA  
Thank You

Renzo

---

**From:** Richard Navarro [mailto:rnavarroelectric@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:16 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson; Mlpa; Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:**

Hello, My name is Rich Navarro. I am a buisness owner and a born and raised San Franciscan. I have lived in California my entire life. I have my own boat and have been fishing in the ocean since my Uncle took me out in the 70s. I love fishing and all my inlaws, kids, wife, parents, brothers, and freinds support my recreational fishing. It has been a huge part of my life as well as friends and family. We will all be saddened if we are not allowed to fish areas that are supported in 2-XA!

Please support 2-XA for the following reasons.

*Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:*

*Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA*

*Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines*

*Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support*

*Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups*

*Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster*

*Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.*

*Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.*

*Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.*

*Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.*

*Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:*

*Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.*

*Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.*

*Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations*

*Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.*

*Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.*

I know we fisherman have the pulse on what's going on out on our ocean waters. We don't want to catch the last fish and have conservation in our hearts and minds also. We have worked hard on mapping out all of the area's that we need to have opened within the guide line of the MLPA process... So, please don't let us Recreational Hook and line fisherman down. Support 2-XA proposal that works for everyone.

Thanks,

Rich Navarro

---

**From:** CPCUInsWiz@aol.com [mailto:CPCUInsWiz@aol.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 9:16 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

I support Proposal 2-XA. I am a voter, and a tax payer!

Richard W. Johnson

---

From: Robert Filbrun [mailto:[filbrunrl@sbcglobal.net](mailto:filbrunrl@sbcglobal.net)]

Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2008 10:41 AM

To: MLPAComments  
Subject: MLPA Proposal 2-XA

I support Proposal 2-XA. It is the only one that is even close to striking a balance between protection and usage of our ocean resources.

Best regards,

Robert Filbrun

---

**From:** ROGER A ARNAL [mailto:rarnal@att.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 1:32 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Please support Proposal 2-XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force for the MLPA Initiative's Second Phase

I am a 65-year old grandfather and lived in the Bay Area all my life. My late dad took me fishing for years starting in 1948. When he got older, I took him fishing. Now my son takes me and my grandson fishing.

Fishing is important to me and I spend tons of money doing it on from my boat, my son's boat, and my friend's boats.

Please accept my support for Proposal 2-XA. It's well balanced and has a broad support.

Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,  
Roger Arnal  
Daly City, CA

---

**From:** Ryan Johnson [mailto:helijumpr@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 7:32 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

I support Proposal 2-XA

Ryan Johnson

---

**From:** Steve Cook [mailto:[scook@netbox.com](mailto:scook@netbox.com)]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 6:01 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Comments

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least



socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Very truly yours,  
Steven Cook  
Oakland, California

---

**From:** Sue McRitchie [mailto:suemcrichtie@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 9:02 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposed Closures

Dear Sirs:

I implore you for the sake of the people of the great state of California to adopt the only proposal that makes any sense and that we can all at least live with - Proposal 2XA. I believe this proposal is in the best interest of all concerned.

Thank you for your time.

Susan McRitchie

---

**From:** TerryTifft@aol.com [mailto:TerryTifft@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 5:07 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** 2-XA

I highly recommend that you adopt 2-XA. In light of the fact that my grandchildren have had their salmon season taken away, I'd like to be able to safely take them fishing for something.

Thank you in advance.

Terry Tifft

---

From: maiertim@comcast.net [<mailto:maiertim@comcast.net>]  
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2008 6:29 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern:

I retired three years ago and recreational ocean fishing for salmon, rock cod and crab has become one of my passions. I and my friends finally have the time to enjoy one of California's great natural resources, as well as help to support and enjoy local restaurants,

tackle shops, party boats and other small businesses. While I support the stated purpose of the MLPA to protect our marine life, I sincerely hope that all interested parties are considered equally in the final recommendation and the preferred alternative is based upon the best available science.

Of the three proposals remaining in the process, I strongly recommend you consider MLPA proposal #2-XA, as it balances the interests of all Californians - socio-economically, environmentally and an initiative I would be proud to pass on to my son.

Thanks for your consideration.

Tim Maier

---

**From:** Tim McRitchie [mailto:[tim\\_mccritchie@yahoo.com](mailto:tim_mccritchie@yahoo.com)]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 8:52 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** fishing area closures

Dear sirs,

The draconian proposals put forth are hard to swallow and even harder to imagine. Having lived here in northern California my whole life and been lucky enough to be able to use our wonderful natural resources, I must say that the only proposal that makes any sense is 2XA. It meets or exceeds minimum requirements as demanded, allows for safe use of the ocean, and would allow access to fishing areas that absolutely should be accessible. The economic issue is a whole nuther question, and the livelihoods of many depend on your prudent judgement, so please, strongly consider the only proposal that we can all live with, and that includes our children and generations to come, proposal 2XA.

Tim McRitchie

---

**From:** Tim Corfey [mailto:[tcorfey@alamedanet.net](mailto:tcorfey@alamedanet.net)]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 12:11 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Please vote yes for proposal 2-XA

To MLPA task force members,

I moved to Northern California from the East Coast almost 20 years ago. One of the major reasons to move here was the fact that the state of California had many open natural areas and it promises it's citizens access to the ocean waters. There are evidently some people in this state that came here and saw the willingness to accept all people as a threat to be corrected. Their goal is to bring the East Coast mentality of locking people out of natural areas by using the government to do there dirty work. I see that mentality at work in all the proposals. But the proposal that does this the least is proposal 2-XA. It really makes me sick to my stomach when I realize that my children will never experience the wonderful openness that I have felt on the ocean. From now on that will have to be so careful to not cross imaginary lines in

the water with their fishing poles how do you explain this to a four year-old? In my opinion the proposals other than 2-XA must have been cobbled together by people who either do not partake in our oceans bounty or only like to visit nature and observe nature. They do not have any respect for other peoples ideas or desires and are fixated on locking people out of as much of our ocean as possible. Personally I like visit and observe nature but, I also want to be a part of it, I want to touch it and I want to live it. Proposal 2-XA is the most reasonable, balanced and well thought out proposal on the table at this time. Please support proposal 2-XA and let everyone know you want to have strong protection for the ocean but you also want to respect the rights of all of the people to enjoy nature on their own terms.

Kindest Regards,  
Timothy Corfey  
Alameda CA

---

**From:** tony\_freitas@comcast.net [mailto:tony\_freitas@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 3:22 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Supporting 2-xa

I would like to urge the passing of proposal 2-xa as the safest best bet for all involved. As a local fisherman i see it as the most scientific conservation friendly proposal. As a small boat owner it seems like the only safe proposal being offered please see it my way and find it fit to pass proposal 2-xa!

Thank you,  
Tony Freitas and family

---

**From:** William Odum [mailto:rockn785@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 29, 2008 6:36 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA All the Way

I am writing this email to implore you please vote for and implement Proposal 2-XA. I believe that proposal 2-XA is a hybrid that includes all interested party's concerns for the future health of our ecosystem here on the Pacific Ocean. I encourage you not to give into the demands of the interests that demand a hands off approach to the stewardship. I have used the resources of the Pacific Ocean for over 40 years. I am a true believer of demanding a healthy ecology for the Pacific Ocean, while at the same time utilizing its resources.

Please I implore you to pass and implement Proposal 2-Xa for the MLPA process

Sincerely,  
William G. Odum

---